



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Am  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,043	04/27/2001	Richard Hans Harvey	655/64944	2690

7590                  05/20/2005

RICHARD F. JAWORSKI  
Cooper & Dunham LLP  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER

CORRIELUS, JEAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2162

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/844,043	HARVEY, RICHARD HANS	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jean M Corrielus	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on December 13, 2004, in which claims 1-29 are presented for further examination.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed December 13, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. (See Examiner's Remark).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Applicant's admitted related art (see specification pages 1-6, line 11).

As to claim 1, Applicant's admitted related recited the claimed "receiving a service query, including a filter having one or more filter items" as a X.500 search query including a filter having one or more filter items as a X.500 search service using

arguments which indicates where to start the search (filter) and what information should be returned (selection), the filter items are presented by letters (A,B, C, D and E) (see applicant's admitted related art, specification page 1, line 18-page 2 line 11); "expanding the filter" as using logic principle, boolean logic, an arbitrarily complex search filter to expand a number of relatively simpler terms, by removing the brackets in the complex search filter (see applicant's admitted related art, specification page 3, line 12-page 4 line 20); and "applying a condition test to each filter item to determine if the filter item includes a Not connective and if the filter item" wherein one of two types of filter items after a complex filter has been expanded into a number of simpler filter terms, the resulting filter (see applicant's admitted related art, specification page 2, line 15-page 2 line 10).

As to claim 7, Applicant's admitted related art discloses the claimed "wherein the condition test further includes determining if each filter item can be pre-evaluated to false, such that the expanded term can be ignored" using logic principle, boolean logic, an arbitrarily complex, the search filter can be expanded to a number of relatively simpler terms, by removing the brackets in the complex search filter, resulting in an expression which is an OR of ANDs which is also known as a sum of term; wherein the expression !(A.B) results in the filter terms : !A + !B (see applicant's admitted related art, specification page 3, line 12-page 4 line 20).

As to claim 8, Applicant's admitted related art discloses the claimed "wherein the filter is expanded to a minimum set of terms" using logic principle, boolean logic, an arbitrarily complex search filter to expand a number of relatively simpler terms, by removing the brackets in the complex search filter (see Applicant's admitted related art, specification page 3, line 12-page 4 line 20).

As to claim 17, Applicant's admitted related art discloses the claimed "receiving a service query" as a X.500 search service using arguments which indicate where to start the search (see applicant's admitted related art, specification page 1, line 18-page 2 line 11); "applying a filter to the service query resulting in zero or more filter items" condition that applies to the search (filters) and what information should be returned (selection).

Applicant should duly note, for instance when a user wish to interrogate a directory to locate titles of managers of an organization who have salaries above \$60,000.00 or who are not in certain offices of the organization, so the user performs a search query wherein: title=manager AND salary > 60000 AND (mobilePhone present OR (NOT (locality=Melb\* OR locality = Syd\*))), which can express as a logical expression A.B.(C+!(D+E)); the filter items are presented by letters (A,B, C, D and E) (see applicant's admitted related art, specification page 1, line 18-page 2 line 11); and "applying a condition test to each filter item to determine a form of the filter item" after a complex filter has been expanded into a number of simpler filter terms, the resulting filter terms !A + !B wherein ! Is a NOT connective in the filter is converted to SQL statement (see applicant's admitted related art, specification page 2, line 15-page 2 line 10).

5. Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ciccarelli US Patent no. 6,009,422.

As to claimed 28, Ciccarelli discloses the claimed a plurality of tables, each table having a plurality of rows and columns, and storing arbitrary data, wherein at least one of the tables has information used to resolve filters in a search service (col.8, lines 6-20); and a condition tester that determine whether a filter item is a type only filter item or a type and value filter item (col.4, lines 41-64).

As to claim 29, Ciccarelli discloses the claimed a computer usable medium having computer readable program code embodied on said medium, wherein the computer readable program code is for applying a condition test to each filter item of a filter to determine if the filter item is type only filter item or type and value filter item, and wherein the filter is adapted for interaction with a search service of a directory service arrangement (col.4, lines 41-64; col.8, lines 6-20).

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were

Art Unit: 2162

made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 2-6 and 18-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted related art and Ciccarelli US Patent no. 6,009,422.

As to claim 2, Applicant's admitted prior art discloses substantially the invention claimed. However, Applicant's admitted related art does not explicitly wherein the two types of filter items comprise a type only filter item and a type and value filter item.

Ciccarelli, on the other hand, discloses the claimed wherein the two types of filter items comprises a type only filter item and a type and value filter item the NOT connective takes a set of document (filter item) defined by an initial condition, then removes elements from that set which meet subsequent conditions (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the electronic directories, provided therein (See Applicant's admitted related art page 1) would incorporate the use wherein the two types of filter items comprises a type only filter item and a type and value filter item, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Ciccarelli (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5). The motivation being to provide maximum search flexibility when specifying potentially complex conditions which data objects must meet in order to be identified as candidates for return from a query operation.

As to claim 3, Applicant's admitted related art discloses substantially the invention claimed. However, Applicant's admitted related art does not explicitly wherein a logical methodology is applied to evaluate NOT connective associated with type only filter items. Ciccarelli, on the other hand, discloses the claimed wherein a logical methodology is applied to evaluate NOT connective associated with type only filter items the NOT connective takes a set of document (filter item) defined by an initial condition, then removes elements from that set which meet subsequent conditions (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the electronic directories, provided therein (See Applicant's admitted related art page 1) would incorporate the use wherein a logical methodology is applied to evaluate NOT connective associated with type only filter items, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Ciccarelli (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5). The motivation being to provide maximum search flexibility when specifying potentially complex conditions which data objects must meet in order to be identified as candidates for return from a query operation.

As to claim 4, Applicant's admitted related art discloses substantially the invention claimed. However, Applicant's admitted related art does not explicitly wherein the logical methodology comprises a subtraction method. Ciccarelli discloses the claimed wherein the logical methodology comprises a subtraction method (col.4, lines 62-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data

processing, at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the electronic directories, provided therein (See Applicant's admitted related art page 1) would incorporate the use wherein the logical methodology comprises a subtraction method, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Ciccarelli (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5). The motivation being to provide maximum search flexibility when specifying potentially complex conditions which data objects must meet in order to be identified as candidates for return from a query operation.

As to claim 5, Applicant's admitted related art discloses substantially the invention claimed. However, Applicant's admitted prior art does not explicitly wherein a NOT connective associated with a type and value filter item is pushed inside the filter item, resulting in changing an operator inside the filter item. Ciccarelli discloses the claimed wherein a NOT connective associated with a type and value filter item is pushed inside the filter item, resulting in changing an operator inside the filter item (col.4, line 8-col.5, line 25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the electronic directories, provided therein (See Applicant's admitted related art page 1) would incorporate the use wherein a NOT connective associated with a type and value filter item is pushed inside the filter item, resulting in changing an operator inside the filter item, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Ciccarelli (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5). The motivation being to provide maximum search flexibility when specifying potentially complex conditions which data objects must meet in order to be identified as candidates for return from a query operation.

As to claim 6, Applicant's admitted related art discloses substantially the invention claimed. However, Applicant's admitted related art does not explicitly wherein the condition test determines if the filter item is a type only filter item. Ciccarelli discloses the claimed wherein the condition test determines if the filter item is a type only filter item the NOT connective takes a set of document (filter item) defined by an initial condition, then removes elements from that set which meet subsequent conditions (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the electronic directories, provided therein (See Applicants admitted related art page 1) would incorporate the use wherein the condition test determines if the filter item is a type only filter item, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Ciccarelli (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5). The motivation being to provide maximum search flexibility when specifying potentially complex conditions which data objects must meet in order to be identified as candidates for return from a query operation.

As to claim 7, Applicant's admitted related art discloses substantially the invention claimed. However, Applicant's admitted prior art does not explicitly wherein the condition test further includes determining if each filter item can be pre-evaluated to true. Ciccarelli discloses the claimed wherein the condition test further includes determining if each filter item can be pre-evaluated to true (col.4, line 8-col.5, line 25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time

the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the electronic directories, provided therein (See Applicant's admitted related art page 1) would incorporate the use wherein the condition test further includes determining if each filter item can be pre-evaluated to true, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Ciccarelli (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5). The motivation being to provide maximum search flexibility when specifying potentially complex conditions which data objects must meet in order to be identified as candidates for return from a query operation.

As to claim 19, Applicant's admitted related art discloses substantially the invention claimed. However, Applicant's admitted prior art does not explicitly evaluating the filter item in accordance with a logical methodology if the filter item is type only form. Ciccarelli discloses the claimed evaluating the filter item in accordance with a logical methodology if the filter item is type only form the NOT connective takes a set of document (filter item) defined by an initial condition, then removes elements from that set which meet subsequent conditions (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the electronic directories, provided therein (See Applicant's admitted related art page 1) would incorporate the use of evaluating the filter item in accordance with a logical methodology if the filter item is type only form, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Ciccarelli (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5). The motivation being to provide

maximum search flexibility when specifying potentially complex conditions which data objects must meet in order to be identified as candidates for return from a query operation.

As to claim 20, Applicant's admitted related art discloses substantially the invention claimed. However, Applicant's admitted prior art does not explicitly wherein the logical methodology comprises a subtraction method. Ciccarelli discloses the claimed wherein the logical methodology comprises a subtraction method (col.4, lines 62-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the electronic directories, provided therein (See Applicants admitted related art page 1) would incorporate the use wherein the logical methodology comprises a subtraction method, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Ciccarelli (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5). The motivation being to provide maximum search flexibility when specifying potentially complex conditions which data objects must meet in order to be identified as candidates for return from a query operation.

As to claim 21, Applicants admitted related art discloses substantially the invention claimed. However, Applicants admitted prior art does not explicitly wherein the subtraction method includes the use of an ANSI SQL expert clause. Ciccarelli discloses the claimed wherein the subtraction method includes the use of an ANSI SQL expert clause (col.4, lines 5-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to combine the

teachings of the cited references, wherein the electronic directories, provided therein (See Applicants admitted related art page 1) would incorporate the use wherein the subtraction method includes the use of an ANSI SQL expert clause, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Ciccarelli (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5). The motivation being to provide maximum search flexibility when specifying potentially complex conditions which data objects must meet in order to be identified as candidates for return from a query operation.

As to claim 22, Applicants admitted related art discloses substantially the invention claimed. However, Applicants admitted related art does not explicitly wherein the subtraction method transforms each filter item to a form that contains fewer or NOT connectives. Ciccarelli discloses the claimed wherein the subtraction method transforms each filter item to a form that contains fewer or NOT connectives (col.4, lines 5-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the electronic directories, provided therein (See Applicants admitted related art page 1) would incorporate the use wherein the subtraction method transforms each filter item to a form that contains fewer or NOT connectives, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Ciccarelli (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5). The motivation being to provide maximum search flexibility when specifying potentially complex conditions which data objects must meet in order to be identified as candidates for return from a query operation.

As to claim 23, Applicants admitted related art discloses substantially the invention claimed. However, Applicants admitted related art does not explicitly wherein the condition test determines if the filter item is a type and value filter item. Ciccarelli discloses the claimed wherein the condition test determines if the filter item is a type and value filter item (col.4, line 8-col.5, line 25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the electronic directories, provided therein (See Applicants admitted related art page 1) would incorporate the use wherein the condition test determines if the filter item is a type and value filter item, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Ciccarelli (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5). The motivation being to provide maximum search flexibility when specifying potentially complex conditions which data objects must meet in order to be identified as candidates for return from a query operation.

As to claim 24, Applicant's admitted related art discloses the claimed wherein if the filter item is a type and value form, adding SQL representing the filter item to an expression to be evaluated which may involve at least one table join (see applicant's admitted related art, specification page 2, line 15-page 2 line 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the electronic directories, provided therein (See Applicant's admitted related art page 1) would incorporate the use wherein if the filter item is a type and value form, adding SQL representing the filter item to an expression to be evaluated which may involve at least one table join, in the same

conventional manner as disclosed by Ciccarelli (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5). The motivation being to provide maximum search flexibility when specifying potentially complex conditions which data objects must meet in order to be identified as candidates for return from a query operation.

As to claim 25, Applicant's admitted related art discloses substantially the invention claimed. However, Applicant's admitted prior art does not explicitly wherein if the filter item is an inverse of the type and value filter item, pushing the NOT connective inside the filter item. Ciccarelli discloses the claimed wherein if the filter item is an inverse of the type and value filter item, pushing the NOT connective inside the filter item (col.4, lines 5-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the electronic directories, provided therein (See Applicant's admitted related art page 1) would incorporate the use wherein if the filter item is an inverse of the type and value filter item, pushing the NOT connective inside the filter item, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Ciccarelli (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5). The motivation being to provide maximum search flexibility when specifying potentially complex conditions which data objects must meet in order to be identified as candidates for return from a query operation.

As to claim 26, Applicant's admitted related art discloses substantially the invention claimed. However, Applicant's admitted prior art does not explicitly applying the pushed NOT connective to an operator. Ciccarelli discloses the claimed applying the pushed NOT connective to an operator (col.4, lines 5-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the electronic directories, provided therein (See Applicant's admitted related art page 1) would incorporate the use wherein a logical methodology is applied to evaluate NOT connective associated with type only filter items, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Ciccarelli (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5). The motivation being to provide maximum search flexibility when specifying potentially complex conditions which data objects must meet in order to be identified as candidates for return from a query operation.

As to claim 27, Applicant's admitted related art discloses substantially the invention claimed. However, Applicant's admitted prior art does not explicitly applying the pushed NOT is effected by inverted the operator. Ciccarelli discloses the claimed applying the pushed NOT is effected by inverted the operator (col.4, lines 5-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the electronic directories, provided therein (See Applicant's admitted related art page 1) would incorporate the use of applying the pushed NOT is effected by inverted the operator, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Ciccarelli (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 5). The motivation being to provide maximum search flexibility when specifying

potentially complex conditions which data objects must meet in order to be identified as candidates for return from a query operation.

**Remark**

(A). Applicants asserted that the related art in the specification pages 1-6) is not prior art. Applicants should duly note the description of the related art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98 is a paragraph(s) describing to the extent practical the state of the prior art or other information disclosed known to the applicant, including references to specific prior art or other information where appropriate. Where applicable, the problems involved in the prior art or other information disclosed which are solved by the applicant's invention should be indicated. See also MPEP § 608.01(a), § 608.01(p) and § 707.05(b). Applicants are reminded that a rationale for 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection (Multiple References), wherein the modification of the basic reference in light of the secondary prior art is proper because the applied references are so related that the appearance of features shown in one would suggest the application of those features to the other. See *In re Rosen*, 673 F.2d 388, 213 USPQ 347 (CCPA 1982); *In re Carter*, 673 F.2d 1378, 213 USPQ 625 (CCPA 1982), and *In re Glavas*, 230 F.2d 447, 109 USPQ 50 (CCPA 1956). Further, it is noted that case law has held that a designer skilled in the art is charged with knowledge of the related art; therefore, the combination of old elements, herein, would have been well within the level of ordinary skill. See *In re Antle*, 444 F.2d 1168, 170 USPQ 285 (CCPA 1971) and *In re Nalbandian*, 661 F.2d 1214, 211 USPQ 782 (CCPA 1981).

*Conclusion*

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2162

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean M Corrielus whose telephone number is (571) 272-4032. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 hours shift.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jean M Corrielus  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2162

May 9, 2005